

IASSNS-HEP-98-40

RU-98-15

hep-ph/9805240

May 1998

Supergravity Resolution of the Unification to Planck Scale Hierarchy

Christopher Kolda¹ and Nir Polonsky²

¹ *School of Natural Sciences, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, NJ 08540, USA*

² *Department of Physics and Astronomy, Rutgers University, Piscataway, NJ 08854, USA*

Abstract

It is demonstrated how the hierarchy between the gauge coupling unification scale of minimal supersymmetry and the Planck (or string) scale, which resembles in order of magnitude a loop factor, can actually be explained as such in supergravity-coupled supersymmetry. A gauge and global singlet field acquires a linear potential term due to its one-loop supergravity interactions and slides to the desired scale. The singlet field can then provide the seed for the breaking of the unified theory at the appropriate scale via its couplings to fields in the adjoint representation.

The minimal supersymmetric extension of the Standard Model (the MSSM) of electroweak and strong interactions is well known to be consistent with the unification of the electroweak and strong couplings at a scale $M_G \simeq 3 \times 10^{16}$ GeV. Given the current measured values of the couplings, the unification holds at the percentile level (in the units of the unified coupling $\alpha_G \sim 0.04$) with only $\mathcal{O}(1)$ ambiguity in the unification scale (for example, see Refs. [1, 2]). And because the apparent unification scale is well below the Planck scale, Planck-suppressed corrections are sufficiently small that one can trust the field theory calculation [1]. While an impressive result, this particular scale for unification is poorly understood.

Specifically, the unification scale lies two orders of magnitude below the (reduced) Planck scale, M_P , and an order of magnitude below the predicted unification scale in perturbative heterotic string theory, $\sim 5 \times 10^{17}$ GeV [3]. Within the context of string theory, there are a number of proposals for alleviating this discrepancy, including extra matter at intermediate scales, altered unification conditions, and non-perturbative/M-theory effects (for a review, see Ref. [4].) Alternatively, there may be a true grand-unified theory (GUT) in the decades between the Planck (or string) scale and the phenomenologically determined unification scale¹.

However, in this latter case, one is usually forced to introduce the scale of GUT-breaking (*i.e.*, the unification scale) as an additional fundamental scale in the problem. It would clearly be preferable to find some mechanism by which one or more of the seemingly fundamental scales in the theory (the Planck scale, the GUT scale, the supersymmetry-breaking scale) could be derived from the others. There are already well-motivated explanations of the supersymmetry-breaking scale as the strong coupling scale of some new gauge interaction, replacing it as a fundamental scale in favor of the Planck scale and an $\mathcal{O}(1)$ gauge coupling [6]. In this paper we will derive a mechanism by which the GUT scale can in turn be extracted as a function of the Planck scale, once supersymmetry is broken.

Several models already exist in the literature for doing just this. One of the earliest is the “inverted hierarchy” model of Witten [7]. In this toy model the only fundamental scale is the scale of supersymmetry-breaking. The GUT is broken at tree-level at a scale determined by the vacuum expectation value (vev) of a gauge singlet. That singlet, however, is undetermined at tree-level and only later fixed by logarithmically divergent corrections to the potential. Because of the logarithms, the GUT scale is exponentially far from the supersymmetry-breaking scale. Other more realistic models have also relied on logarithmically divergent contributions to generate the GUT scale, but down from the Planck scale instead of up from the supersymmetry-breaking scale. Since the GUT scale is so close to the Planck scale, though, the exponential hierarchy must be arranged to be small. The model of Goldberg [8] generates the GUT scale through the vev of a singlet when its supersymmetry-breaking mass-squared is driven

¹ The actual embedding of a unified theory into a string theory is not straightforward and will not be addressed here. However recent results on non-perturbative solutions to string theories (*e.g.*, F-theory [5]) show, in principle, tremendous flexibility in the embeddings that can be arranged.

negative in the infrared by large Yukawa interactions (see below). A very different model by Cheng [9] generates the GUT scale as the scale of strong gauge dynamics, that is, through the usual dimensional transmutation.

Unlike all of these models, we will explain the GUT-to-Planck scale ratio not in terms of an exponential hierarchy as is generated by logarithmic corrections, but rather by a loop-factor hierarchy generated by quadratic divergences. Such a hierarchy can be realized within perturbation theory once a globally supersymmetric theory is coupled to spontaneously broken supergravity. (We will assume for concreteness that supersymmetry-breaking is communicated from a hidden sector of the theory to the visible/Standard Model sector via supergravity interactions alone, but will comment later on other possibilities.) We will show that by replacing dimensionful parameters which correspond to the unification scale with appropriate couplings of adjoints fields to a singlet, and properly treating the supergravity interactions of the singlet, the desired hierarchy emerges naturally and is indeed given by a loop factor. The relationship of this mechanism to other recently proposed scenarios [10, 11] using one-loop supergravity-induced potentials for singlet fields coupled to fundamentals, rather than adjoints, will be discussed in detail below.

Consider for concreteness an $SU(5)$ theory. The scale in which the unified symmetry is broken is described most economically by a mass parameter, $M \simeq M_G$. The minimal choice of a superpotential is:

$$W = M \text{Tr } \Sigma^2 + \lambda \text{Tr } \Sigma^3, \quad (1)$$

where Σ is in the adjoint representation of $SU(5)$. The scalar potential corresponding to Eq. (1) above has three degenerate minima at which $SU(5)$ is alternatively unbroken, broken to $SU(4) \times U(1)$, or to $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$. In the latter two cases, Σ receives a vev $\sim M/\lambda$, defining the GUT scale.

At this level, the new scale $M = M_G$ is *ad hoc* — it bears no obvious relation to any other scale in the theory. It would seem natural to replace the explicit mass term with a Yukawa interaction, $M \text{Tr } \Sigma^2 \rightarrow S \text{Tr } \Sigma^2$ with S a gauge singlet, provided that the vev of S is specified, $\langle S \rangle = M_G$. However, the additional equations of motion corresponding to $F_S = 0$ drive Σ to the origin, $\langle \Sigma \rangle = 0$, leaving $SU(5)$ unbroken. Satisfactory models involve at least two distinct Higgs fields in the adjoint of $SU(5)$, $\Sigma_{1,2}$. For example, consider the superpotential [8],

$$W = \lambda S \text{Tr } \Sigma_1 \Sigma_2 + \lambda' \text{Tr } \Sigma_1^2 \Sigma_2, \quad (2)$$

where S is again a gauge singlet. Such a superpotential is the most general one allowed by a combination of an R /phase-symmetry and a Z_4 discrete symmetry. In particular, S^n and all mass terms are forbidden in W . This superpotential allows for $SU(5)$ to break once the singlet S develops a vacuum expectation value,

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\Sigma_2} = 0 &\Rightarrow \Sigma_1 = \frac{\lambda}{\lambda'} S \times \text{diag}(2, 2, 2, -3, -3) \\ F_{\Sigma_1} = F_S = 0 &\Rightarrow \Sigma_2 = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

However, Eq. (2) alone leaves S undetermined. As is usually the case in supersymmetric GUT's, the minimum of Eq. (3) is simply one of several degenerate vacua, whose degeneracy is lifted in a model-dependent way once the explicit soft supersymmetry breaking effects are taken into account. We will assume that it is lifted such that the vacuum corresponds to the Standard Model $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ configuration. Eq. (3) is then stable up to corrections $\sim m_{3/2}$ [12].

Since S is undetermined in the supersymmetric limit, its value must be fixed by its supergravity interactions once (local) supersymmetry is broken spontaneously in some hidden sector of the theory. It was proposed [8, 13] that a supergravity-generated scalar-potential of the form $m_{3/2}^2 |S|^2$, where $m_{3/2} \sim m_W$ is the gravitino mass, is sufficient for that purpose. Because the Yukawa interaction of Eq. (2) renormalizes the singlet wave-function, the soft supersymmetry-breaking mass-squared for S diminishes logarithmically with the momentum scale. Depending on the coupling strength and the relevant group theory factors, at some scale Q_0 the renormalized singlet mass-squared may turn negative. It is straightforward to show that the minimization of the one-loop effective potential in this case gives $\langle S \rangle \simeq Q_0$ [14]. By carefully choosing the matter content of the theory and the couplings one may arrange for $Q_0 \simeq M_G$ [8, 13]. While possible, such a solution is far from unique and does not explain the “loop-factor”-like hierarchy. It also implicitly assumes that the global symmetries of the superpotential are exact symmetries of the vacuum. Note that the above proposal implies, as one often finds in supergravity models, a light ($\sim m_{3/2}$) pseudo-Goldstone boson which carries a large energy density, which may be cosmologically inconvenient [15].

It is likely, however, that the global symmetries of the superpotential in Eq. (2) are only accidental symmetries and are due to, *e.g.*, symmetries of the underlying theory and the renormalizability condition [16]. These accidental symmetries of the superpotential may be explicitly broken in the low-energy theory by Planck-suppressed operators. Specifically, non-holomorphic operators which violate the symmetries generically appear in the Kähler potential [17]. The singlet S does not carry in this case any conserved (gauge or global) quantum numbers. Being a true singlet, S would be generically dressed by quadratically divergent (supergravity) tadpole loop-diagrams which lead, once supersymmetry is spontaneously broken, to a linear shift in the effective scalar potential [18, 10, 11]:

$$V \rightarrow V + (\gamma m_{3/2}^2 M_P S + h.c.) + (\beta \epsilon m_{3/2} M_P F_S + h.c.) \quad (4)$$

where $S = S + \theta \psi_S + \theta^2 F_S$, β and γ are loop-factors with arbitrary phases, and ϵ is a measure in Planckian units of the vacuum expectation values of the supersymmetry breaking fields in the hidden sector (see Ref. [11] for a complete discussion). Hereafter we set, for simplicity, $\epsilon = 0$ (but see below).

The resulting scalar potential for S reads

$$V(S) = m_S^2 |S|^2 + (\gamma m_{3/2}^2 M_P S + h.c.). \quad (5)$$

Obviously, the potential of Eq. (5) is bounded from below if and only if (the renormalized) $m_S^2 > 0$; without loss of generality, we will identify $m_S^2 = m_{3/2}^2$, which is positive definite. This is an important difference between this model and that of Ref. [8] in which GUT-breaking was driven by m_S^2 at M_G becoming negative through renormalization group effects. If the Yukawa coupling, λ , of S to the adjoints is large, m_S^2 can indeed be driven negative in the infrared; we will assume that $m_S^2 > 0$ at the M_G scale, which simply puts a model-dependent upper bound (of $\mathcal{O}(1)$) on λ .

The potential, Eq. (5), is minimized for

$$S \simeq -\gamma^\dagger M_P. \quad (6)$$

The loop factor

$$\gamma \simeq N \left(\frac{c}{16\pi^2} \right)^n \quad (7)$$

is determined by: the arbitrary dimensionless Kähler couplings, c ; the loop-order at which the divergent supergravity contributions appear, n (generically $n = 1$ or 2); and the multiplicity of the light states circulating in the tadpole loops, which is summed in N . Hence, one expects γ to be in the range of $10^{-2\pm 2}$, which is precisely the scale hierarchy we had hoped to achieve. Note that the resulting hierarchy is independent of the gravitino mass, and hence, of the scale of supersymmetry breaking in the hidden sector. Therefore this mechanism works equally well in models with low supersymmetry-breaking scales, such as so-called gauge-mediated models, so long as S only gets its mass via supergravity interactions. However, there will always remain in the light spectrum a scalar with mass $\sim m_{3/2}$.

If we remove our assumption that $\epsilon = 0$ and instead allow $\epsilon \sim 1$, we find that the potential is shifted at its minima by $V \sim m_{3/2}^2 M_G^2$, which is the same order as the potential with $\epsilon = 0$; equivalently, Σ_2 shifts by $\sim m_{3/2}$. Since we are not fully analyzing the relative structure of the local minima to an accuracy better than $m_{3/2}^2 M_G^2$, this shift is irrelevant at our current level of discussion. Effective potential corrections can also be shown to be negligible.

However, in order for this mechanism to work, we must forbid tree-level mixing of hidden and visible fields of the form $K = ZZ^\dagger S/M_P + h.c.$, which could render $\gamma \sim 1$, rather than 10^{-2} . While we have no symmetry argument for excluding such terms (unlike for terms linear in Z or $Z^\dagger$), we do know that other related terms, such as $ZZ^\dagger QQ^\dagger$ (for Q a matter superfield) must have coefficients $\lesssim 10^{-3}$ in order to avoid large flavor changing neutral currents; similar coefficients for the $ZZ^\dagger S$ operator would render it harmless. This is an issue that arises in all models of supergravity-mediated supersymmetry breaking, and this model is no exception. Also note that $\epsilon = 0$ can resolve cosmological issues [15] which are typically associated with light hidden-sector moduli. These issues resurface here, however, due to the light singlet with $\langle S \rangle \gg m_{3/2}$.

Lastly, this model can be contrasted to a recently proposed scenario² for solv-

²The distinction from low-energy supersymmetry breaking scenarios [10] is clearer and stems

ing the μ -problem in supergravity-coupled supersymmetry models [11] in which the singlet coupled to a pair of Higgs fields in the fundamental and anti-fundamental representations of the underlying gauge group. In that model, there existed a local minimum (not the desired one in which the μ -parameter was generated) in which the singlet received a vev near M_G , but without generating a large vev for any other Higgs field. In particular, the structure of that potential guaranteed that the large singlet vev translated into large and positive squared-masses for the Higgs fields so that no gauge symmetries were broken. Here, the Higgs fields are in the adjoint representation so that their interactions need not be vector-like (adjoints are automatically vector-like with respect to the gauge symmetry, though not necessarily with respect to the global symmetries). In addition, their vev's do not have to be aligned in order to cancel D -terms, which vanish automatically for adjoint fields. Thus a non-trivial superpotential containing cubic interactions, *i.e.*, $\lambda' \text{Tr } \Sigma_1^2 \Sigma_2$, can be devised in order to communicate the large singlet vev to a single self-adjoint field. Hence, a singlet vev $\sim M_G$ translates into an adjoint-field vev of the same order. Note that the two mechanisms cannot both be operative in a model with only one singlet. It is possible, however, that in a model with two singlets, the R -charges (as well as discrete charges) of the fields could be such that one singlet couples only to a vector-like pair of fundamentals while the other couples only to the adjoint fields.

In summary, we have shown that the generic effective potential of a gauge and global (flat) singlet in supergravity background is minimized with the singlet sliding to a scale which is distinguished from the Planck scale (or the relevant cut-off scale) by only a loop factor. If properly coupled to a grand-unified theory it can provide the seed for breaking the unified symmetry at the correct scale. Thus, supergravity can naturally explain the specific choice of the unification scale in terms of the Planck or string scale. The breaking of the unified symmetry is then intimately related to the breaking of supersymmetry, though only the mass of the singlet fields is dependent on the actual scale of supersymmetry-breaking.

Acknowledgments. It is a pleasure to thank Stefan Pokorski for discussions and collaboration in earlier stages of this work, and Hans Peter Nilles for conversations. The work of CK is supported by Department of Energy contract DE-FG02-90ER40542 and through the generosity of Helen and Martin Chooljian. The work of NP is supported by National Science Foundation grant PHY-94-23002. We would also like to thank the Aspen Center for Physics, where this work was initiated, for its hospitality.

References

- [1] P. Langacker and N. Polonsky, Phys. Rev. **D47**, 4028 (1993); *ibid.* **52**, 3081 (1995), and references therein.

from the value of the gravitino mass and from the absence of a S^3 superpotential interaction here.

- [2] P. Chankowski, Z. Pluciennik, and S. Pokorski, Nucl. Phys. **B439**, 23 (1995);
D. Pierce, J. Bagger, K. Matchev, and R.-J. Zhang, Nucl. Phys. **B491**, 3 (1997).
- [3] V. Kaplunovsky, Nucl. Phys. **B307**, 145 (1988).
- [4] K. Dienes, Phys. Rep. **287**, 447 (1997).
- [5] V. Kaplunovsky and J. Louis, Phys. Lett. **B417**, 45 (1998).
- [6] E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. **B188**, 513 (1981).
- [7] E. Witten, Phys. Lett. **105B**, 267 (1981).
- [8] H. Goldberg, Phys. Lett. **B400**, 301 (1997).
- [9] H.-C. Cheng, Phys. Lett. **B410**, 45 (1997).
- [10] H.-P. Nilles and N. Polonsky, Phys. Lett. **B412**, 69 (1997).
- [11] C. Kolda, S. Pokorski, and N. Polonsky, [hep-ph/9803310](#), Phys. Rev. Lett. (*in press*).
- [12] L. Hall, J. Lykken, and S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. **D27**, 2359 (1983).
- [13] For a discussion of the flipped SU(5) case, see A. Dedes, C. Panagiotakopoulos, and K. Tamvakis, [hep-ph/9710563](#).
- [14] For example, see: M. Cvetič and P. Langacker, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A11**, 1247 (1996).
- [15] G. Coughlan, W. Fischler, E. Kolb, S. Raby, and G. Ross, Phys. Lett. **131B**, 59 (1983).
- [16] T. Banks and L. Dixon, Nucl. Phys. **B307**, 93 (1988); S. Coleman, Nucl. Phys. **B310**, 643 (1988).
- [17] For example, see: T. Banks and M. Dine, Phys. Rev. **D50**, 7454 (1994).
- [18] H. P. Nilles, M. Srednicki and D. Wyler, Phys. Lett. **124B**, 337 (1983); A. Lahanas, Phys. Lett. **124B**, 341 (1983); U. Ellwanger, Phys. Lett. **133B**, 187 (1983); J. Bagger and E. Poppitz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 2380 (1993); V. Jain, Phys. Lett. **B351**, 481 (1995); J. Bagger, E. Poppitz, and L. Randall, Nucl. Phys. **B455**, 59 (1995).